IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6842 of 2005

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

DINESHKUMAR DAMODARBHAI TANDEL

Versus

REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICER

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 6842 of 2005

MR IMRAN H PATHAN for Petitioner No. 1

MR M.A.Shaikh, for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

Date of decision: 21/04/2005

ORAL JUDGEMENT

#. Today, when the matter is called out, learned advocate for the petitioner has submitted the additional

affidavit explaining the discrepancies of two years in the school leaving certificate as well as the certificate isued by the authorities under the provisions of Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

#. In this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for an appropriate writ, direction or order directing the respondent passport authority to make necessary rectification in the date of birth mentioned in the passport as stated in the Birth Certificate issued by the competent authority under the provisions of the Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969, as 27th February, 1984 instead of 27th February, 1982 or to issue a fresh passport to the petitioner by mentioning the correct birth date of the petitioner as '27th February, 1984' as mentioned in the certificate issued by the competent authority, i.e. Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation under the provisions of the abovesaid Act.

2. The learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that through inadvertence petitioner's date of birth is wrongly mentioned in the passport as 27th February, 1982 instead of 27th February, 1984 and the respondent authority has refused to entertain his request to correct the said mistake.

3. Shri MA Shaikh, learned Addl. Central Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent authority has submitted that only on the basis of the material given by the petitioner the date of birth was recorded in the passport. He has further submitted that no change in the passport is effected, but for making any correction in the passport, a new passport is normally issued by the authority with correct details if the authority is satisfied with the genuineness of the data to be corrected.

4. Having heard the parties and looking to the facts and circumstances and also the material placed on record, the respondent is directed to look into the case of the petitioner on the basis of the evidence already adduced or which may be adduced by the petitioner to correct the date of birth as mentioned above. The respondent shall take appropriate decision in accordance with law after considering the relevant evidence adduced before him and shall pass an appropriate order as expeditiously as possible.

5. As the respondent authority will have to undertake the exercise of scrutinizing the case of the

petitioner afresh because of the default committed by the petitioner in not placing correct facts at an earlier point of time, a sum of Rs. 5,000/- is ordered to be paid by the petitioner to the respondent authority by way of costs. The petition is allowed. Rule is made absolute . Direct service is permitted.

(M.R.Shah,J)

(pathan)